

08/169,127



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marianne L. Padgett (3) Hidekazu Mizairi / Kunitaka YAMAMOTO  
(2) Jeffrey Costellia (4) Izumi Matsakuma  
Date of Interview 10/10/02 (5) Satoru Hata

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: graphs and table demonstrating advantages of beam shape and ion blocking film

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: claims of record

Identification of prior art discussed: Hongo et al (JP 57-94482)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed adding relative movement descriptions to the beam at the substrate surface, noting its significance to Hongo; Noted proposed use of beam for crystallization (claims 11+ some new claims); discussed ion blocking film & significance in new claims; discussed express recitation of use of a mask; and discussed effect of various amendments on priority date. Copies of signed PTO-1449 from 12/7/95 and 2/22/99 were supplied.  
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

FORM PTOL-413 (REV.1-96)

MARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER